



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,114	06/27/2001	Brian Douglas May	PU000097	4863
7590	04/16/2004		EXAMINER	
THOMSON multimedia Licensing Inc. Patent Operations Two Independence Way P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			GESESSE, TILAHUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	3
			DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/893,114	MAY, BRIAN DOUGLAS
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tilahun B Gesesse	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5,7,11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita et al "Mita"(6,104,341) in view of Hirshchfield et al "Hirschfield" (5,826,170).

As to claims 1,10 Mita discloses a power supply (98) (column 5, lines 64-column 6, line 4 and figure 2) comprising a data signal processing circuit (92) energized by an output supply for producing a data signal (20a), the data signal having a bit error that is determined by the output supply (column 6,lines 31-46) a bit error detector (93) responsive of a magnitude of the bit error generating a signal indicative of a magnitude of the bit error in the data signal(column 6, line 50-column 7,line 8). Mita does not expressly teach a power supply regulator coupled to a source of an input supply for generating the output supply in a feedback manner, in response to the bit error magnitude indicative signal. However, Hirschfield teaches a power supply regulator (20) coupled to a source (12) of an input supply for generating output supply (VO) in a feedback manner (column 4, line 53-column 7, line 2 and figure 2). Since , Mita , suggests that a power supply eliminating noise (column 5 ,line 64-13) Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Mita and Hirschfield in regulating power supply output in a feedback, as taught by Hirschfield , for energizing the signal in order to reduce the bear error of transmitting data.

As to claim 2. Mita discloses the data signal contains one of a video information signal and audio information signal (column 5, lines 15-24).

As to claims 3-5, Mita does not expressly teach a power supply regulator coupled to a source of an input supply for generating the output supply in a feedback manner, in response to the bit error magnitude indicative signal. However, Hirschfield teaches a power supply regulator (20) coupled to a source (12) of an input supply for generating output supply (VO) in a feedback manner (column 4, line 53-column 7, line 2 and figure 2). Since , Mita , suggests that a power supply eliminating noise (column 5 ,line 64-13) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Mita and Hirschfield in regulating power supply output in a feedback, as taught by Hirschfield , for energizing the signal in order to reduce the bear error of transmitting data.

As to claims 7,11 Mita teaches the data signal processing circuit processes a direct broadcast satellite input signal of a direct broadcast satellite receiver (51) (column 4, lines 56-65 and figure 2).

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita in view of Hirschfield as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Soleimani et al "Soleimani" (5,678,228).

As to claim 6, Mita and Hirschfield do not expressly teach the power supply in a standby mode of operation and wherein the successive steps are performed outside the normal, run mode of operation. However, Soleimani teaches a satellite receiver and power conserving technique by switching to standby mode (column 3, lines 42-50). Mita and Hirschfield in the similar field of endeavor, satellite receiver, that monitoring the received signal condition. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Mita, Hirschfield and Soleimani in conserving the power consumption of satellite receive by holding in standby mode the operation of the receiver, as taught by Soleimani, in order to void unnecessary wastage of power.

4. Claims 8-9 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita in view of Hirschfield as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Tilford et al "Tilford" (5,915,020).

As to claims 8-9, and 12, Mita the data signal processing circuit (92) processes a direct broadcast satellite input signal of a direct broadcast satellite receiver system (51) (figure 2), and antenna for producing the data signal, and bit error has a value that is function of power supply voltage (column 4, line 56-column 5, line 45 and figure 2). Mita Hirschfield do not expressly teach low noise block converter for producing the data signal and left hand and right hand circuits polarized signals . However, Tilford teaches low noise block converter for producing the data signal and left hand and right hand circuits polarized signals (column 6, lines 15-29 and figure 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

combine Mita, Hirschfield and Tilford for Low noise block converter and left and right hands polarized signals , as taught by Tilford, for better reception of satellite signal.

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Meirzon et al (Pub.No (2003/0100260) teaches a VSAT terminal including an antenna , a microwave power amplifier , controller monitors power supply and low noise amplifier (abstract and figure 2).

Muterspaugh 5,563, 500) discloses a direct broadcast satellite receiver and low noise block converter mounted in very closed proximity to antenna , and monitors a DC voltage or power supply voltage and selects left and right hands polarization (column 1, lines 8-27) .

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tilahun B Gesesse whose telephone number is 703-308-5873. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TBG

art unit 2684

March 22, 2004

  
John P. Belf  
Examiner